

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated December 13, 2007.

Claims 1, 18 and 19 stand rejected under Section 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Mashino. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 18 and 19 have been amended to require that “*the field oxide film is located directly under substantially all of the pad electrode as viewed cross sectionally.*” For example and without limitation, cross-sectional Fig. 1 of the instant application illustrates that the field oxide film 2 is located directly under substantially all of the pad electrode 4 as viewed cross sectionally.

Mashino fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claims 1, 18 and 19. Instead, Mashino teaches away from this feature because in Mashino the alleged field oxide 204 is only located a very small peripheral part of the alleged pad electrode 211, and clearly is not located directly under substantially all of the alleged pad electrode 211 as called for in claims 1, 18 and 19. One of ordinary skill in the art would never have modified Mashino to provide 204 under the entirety of 211, because this would prevent electrical connections between 211 and 202 that Mashino indicates are required. Thus, all rejections based on Mashino should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 stands rejected under Section 102 as being allegedly anticipated by alleged admitted prior art (AAPA). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 requires that “the hole in the semiconductor substrate being formed within the aperture section of the field oxide film, when perpendicularly viewing the semiconductor substrate, so that **an opening of the hole is smaller than the aperture section of the field oxide film.**” AAPA Figs. 16-17 fail to disclose or suggest this subject matter of claim 1. In AAPA Fig. 16 for example, the hole in substrate 101 is the same size as the hole in the field oxide film

102, because the field oxide film 102 extends all the way to the edge of the hole in the substrate 101 – thereby teaching the opposite of what claim 1 requires in this respect. The fact that the cited art teaches away from the claim evidences the patentable nature thereof. Claims 18-19 define over the AAPA in a similar manner.


Finally, applicant respectfully traverses the “official notice” allegation on page 10 of the Office Action. This allegation is without support and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Joseph A. Rhoa  
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100